

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 10-17, and 21-26 are currently pending in the subject application, and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-6, 10-17, and 21-26 are rejected. Claims 23-26 have been indicated as allowable. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

I. Specification

The Office Action dated August 30, 2005, objects to the amendment to the Specification in the Response to Office Action dated March 7, 2005, filed on June 3, 2005, for introducing new matter into the disclosure. Representative for Applicant thanks Examiner Heneghan for the interview on October 11, 2005. As agreed upon, the objection to the amendment to the Specification will be withdrawn, as will be noted in the forthcoming Interview Summary to be sent to Representative for Applicant.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 10-13, 15-17, 21, and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 10-13, 15-17, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,609,198 to Wood, *et al.* ("Wood") in view of WIPO Patent Application No. 00/04673 to Binding, *et al.* ("Binding") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,593 to Alexander, *et al.* ("Alexander"). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1 and 12 recite that an automated registration arrangement provides a new user with an individual signature certificate having a level of trust commensurate with that of the pedigree certificate and that the automated registration arrangement flags the new user's individual signature certificate with the level of trust of the pedigree certificate in an appropriate storage area. The Office Action asserts that Wood teaches this element by stating that "a session token (an individual signature certificate) is issued to the user that is commensurate with presented credentials" (Office Actions dated July 21, 2004, March 7, 2005, and August 30, 2005; citing Wood, col. 3, ll. 42-53). Representative for Applicant disagrees with the assertion that

Wood teaches providing a new user with an individual signature certificate having a level of trust commensurate with that of a pedigree certificate, as recited in claims 1 and 12. A signature certificate, as known in the art of Public Key Infrastructure (PKI), is a mechanism for reliably conveying the identity of a key pair's owner to the end user (Specification, page 2, ll. 8-9). The PKI establishes that the user owns a key pair by using the digital certificate, which contains information identifying the owner of the key pair, the public key, and the period of time of validity (Specification, page 2, ll. 16-21).

Wood teaches the authentication of an entity to a first authentication level and associating a unique session identifier with the entity (col. 3, ll. 46-48). The entity would thereafter be allowed access to a second authentication level using the unique session identifier (col. 3, ll. 51-53). The unique session identifier, as taught by Wood, is therefore merely a password or authentication scheme, and is not a signature certificate. Accordingly, Wood does not teach an automated registration arrangement that provides a new user with an individual signature certificate having a level of trust commensurate with that of the pedigree certificate, as recited in claims 1 and 12.

The Office Action dated August 30, 2005, relies on Binding to teach "a method for establishing trustworthiness levels wherein a smart card is checked to see if the token (certificate) was produced by an entity with the authority to assign trustworthiness levels (see p. 6, line 11-23), and further suggests that it is necessary for applications that demand high levels of security and secrecy to extend the sphere of trust to include the device itself (see p.2, lines 6-10)." However, the addition of Binding does not cure the deficiencies of Wood to teach or suggest the above recited element in claims 1 and 12. Binding teaches a handheld phone with a pre-loaded trustworthiness certificate that is used to establish a communications connection between users (Abstract). A smart-card is installed in a handheld phone that accesses the trustworthiness level and forms a trustworthiness level token (TLT) and forwards the TLT to third parties to establish the trustworthiness of the handheld phone (page 6, ll. 16-23). Binding, like Wood, therefore teaches the obtainment of a communication session using an authentication scheme that is based on the trustworthiness of the TLT. Binding, however, does not teach or

suggest that a user accesses an automated registration arrangement using a piece of hardware preloaded with a pedigree certificate, and that the automated registration arrangement provides the new user with an individual signature certificate having a level of trust commensurate with that of the pedigree certificate, as recited in claims 1 and 12.

As previously described, Binding teaches that a TLT is forwarded to establish trustworthy two-way communications using a handheld phone. The Office Action dated August 30, 2005 (page 4) improperly equates a communication session with the obtainment of a signature certificate using an automated registration arrangement. As previously described, a signature certificate is a very specific mechanism in the art of PKI enterprise which contains information identifying the owner of the key pair, the public key, and the period of time of validity (Specification, page 2, ll. 16-21). A two-way communication session between handheld phones based on a trustworthiness level is not the same as obtaining a signature certificate from an automated registration authority. Therefore, neither Wood nor Binding teach or suggest the above recited element of claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 12, as well as claims 2-6 and 10-11 which depend from claim 1 and claims 13-17 and 21-22 which depend from claim 12, respectively, is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and that the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 10/17/05

Christopher P. Harris
Christopher P. Harris
Registration No. 43,660

CUSTOMER No.: 26,294

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL, & TUMMINO L.L.P.
526 SUPERIOR AVENUE, SUITE 1111
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114-1400
Phone: (216) 621-2234
Fax: (216) 621-4072